DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 313 SP 033 187

AUTHOR Labaree, David F.
TITLE Doing Good, Doing Science: The Holmes Group Reports and the Rhetorics of Educational Reform.
PUB DATE Mar 91
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Democratic Values; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Persuasive Discourse; Relevance (Education); Rhetorical Criticism; Teacher Education; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Holmes Group Report; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

Contrasting rhetorics of the two Holmes Group reports are examples of the polar types of educational rhetoric that have characterized the literature on educational reform in the United States. In "Tomorrow's Teachers," the argument for educational reform rests on technical grounds; the position is that of the educational expert and the reform effort is portrayed as an exercise in doing science. In "Tomorrow's Schools," the argument is political; the position is that of the ordinary citizen who takes up the reform effort as an exercise in doing good. The appeal to science places control of reform in the hands of academic experts and of the policymakers who are looking for an authoritative and exclusive basis for educational intervention. This approach serves to transform educational policy into a technical exercise in social engineering. The appeal to democratic values demonstrates an unhealthy naivete about the disciplinary power of expertise over the reform process, for underlying the scientistic rhetoric is a structure of technical rationality and expert control which puts severe constraints on the possible forms and effects of educational reform. The democratic rhetoric does not provide more than token constraint on the reform process, but it does provide a mantle of legitimacy under which the power of the expert can operate with relative impunity. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED335313

DOING GOOD, DOING SCIENCE:

THE HOLMES GROUP REPORTS AND THE RHETORICS OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM

David F. Labaree

Michigan State University

March, 1991

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, 1991.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Labaree

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 033-187

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper analyzes the contrasting rhetorics of the two Holmes Group reports as examples of the polar types of educational rhetoric that have characterized the literature on educational reform in the United States. In Tomorrow's Teachers, the authors argue for educational reform on largely technical grounds, speaking from the position of the educational Expert and portraying the reform effort as an exercise in Doing Science. In Tomorrow's Schools, the authors argue for reform primarily on political grounds, speaking from the position of the ordinary Citizen and portraying the effort as an exercise in Doing Good. The appeal to science places control of reform in the hands of academic experts and of the policymakers who are looking for an authoritative and exclusive basis for educational intervention. This approach serves to transform educational policy into a technical exercise in social engineering. On the other hand, the appeal to democratic values, while making a formal gesture toward citizen sovereignty over schools, demonstrates an unhealthy naivete about the disciplinary power of expertise over the reform process. For underlying the scientistic rhetoric is a structure of technical rationality and expert control which puts severe constraints on the possible forms and effects of educational reform. The democratic rhetoric does not provide more than token constraint on the process of reform, but it does provide a mantle of legitimacy under which the power of the expert can operate with relative impunity.

One of the most prominent efforts to bring about educational reform during the last decade in the United States has come from a collection of a hundred deans at leading colleges of education who call themselves the Holmes Group. This organization has proposed a wide-ranging agenda for transforming teacher education and restructuring teacher roles within schools, expressing these ideas in two major reports -- Tomorrow's Teachers (published in 1986) and Tomorrow's Schools (published in 1990). In the years since the first of these reports was issued, a wide range of educators, academics, and policymakers have announced positions supporting or opposing particular elements of the reform proposals it offers. The newer report is likely to draw the same kind of response. However, my aim here is not to continue on in this same vein by offering my own critique of the substance of these reports but instead to analyze their rhetoric. From this perspective, the most striking thing about the Holmes Group reports is that they adopt such sharply contrasting rhetorical styles. In the first one, the authors argue for educational reform on largely technical grounds, speaking from the position of the educational Expert and portraying the reform effort as an exercise in Doing Science. In the second one, the authors argue for reform primarily on political grounds, speaking from the position of the ordinary Citizen and portraying the effort as an exercise in Doing Good.

These two forms of argumentation represent the polar types of educational rhetoric that have characterized the literature on educational reform in the United States during the last two centuries. In this paper, I will explore the nature and significance of these two rhetorics, focusing primarily on the texts of the two reports but referring briefly to other examples in contemporary educational literature. My argument is that there are dangers in relying on

either of these lines of persuasion alone but that the greatest potential danger comes in the combination of the two, such as one finds in the Holmes Group reports. The appeal to science places control of reform in the hands of academic experts and of the policymakers who are looking for an authoritative and exclusive basis for educational intervention. This approach serves to transform educational policy into a technical exercise in social engineering best carried out by members of the credentialed elite who have the appropriate expertise. On the other hand, the appeal to democratic values, while making a formal gesture toward citizen sovereignty over schools, demonstrates an unhealthy naivete about the disciplinary power of expertise over the reform process. For underlying the scientistic rhetoric is a structure of technical rationality and expert control which puts severe constraints on the possible forms and effects of educational reform. Meanwhile the democratic rhetoric does not provide more than token constraint on the process of reform, but it does provide a mantle of legitimacy under which the power of the expert can operate with relative impunity. The problem is to find a way to operationalize democratic values within the process of educational reform in such a way as to pose an effective counterweight to the antidemocratic structure of scientistic expertise.

Scientistic Rhetoric and the Voice of the Expert

In Tomorrow's Teachers, the Holmes Group proposes that one effective way to resolve some of the key problems afflicting American schooling would be to bring about "the transformation of teaching from an occupation into a genuine profession" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. ix). The deans suggest two major reforms that are designed to promote this end: extending and upgrading the quality of

professional education for teachers, and restructuring schools in order to give teachers greater autonomy over their own professional practice. What makes these reforms workable, they say, is the emergence in recent years of a solid professional knowledge base for teachers grounded in the swelling body of scientific research on teaching that is being produced by the very education schools which the deans represent. The report puts it this way:

> Until the last two decades, scholarship in education and the content of the hundreds of university courses in the subject had to rely heavily upon the findings in other disciplines, particularly the behavioral sciences... Within the last twenty years, however, the science of education promised by Dewey, Thorndike, and others at the turn of the century, has become more tangible: The behavioral sciences have been turned on the schools themselves, and not just in laboratory simulations. Studies of life in classrooms now make possible some convincing and counter-intuitive conclusions about schooling and pupil achievement. Ironically, now that the promise of science of education is about to be fulfilled, many current reform recommendations recall an older literature that demands a decrease in the time given to the study of this scholarship (pp. 51-2).

The report's argument -- that educational reform can best be achieved through the professionalization of teaching -- rests solidly on the foundation of the science of education. The authors seek to persuade the reader to accept their recommendations through a vigorous display of scientific expertise. They say: Because of scientifically validated research carried out by qualified experts at the university, we now know what it takes to teach effectively. Through a revamped process of professional education, we can transmit this expertise to teachers, thereby turning them into competent professionals. (The

report uses the word "competence" no fewer than 13 times during one three-page stretch (pp. 28-31).) And we can reassure ourselves that they have acquired this competence through enhanced testing and raised standards for teacher certification. (Words such as "examination," "standards," and "certification" appear 57 times in the first section (pp. 3-20) of the report (Cherryholmes, 1987, p. 504).) This is a reform effort, therefore, that does not require or even permit participation by the lay public, since it depends on a narrowly held form of educational knowledge which can only be generated, interpreted, and implemented by certified experts.

This is a style of rhetoric that is all too familiar to readers of contemporary academic writing in education, prototypically represented by the journal article reporting the results of an empirical investigation. In its narrowest and purest form, this type of presentation boils down to an instrumental analysis of the effectiveness of a set of particular educational behaviors according to the rules of statistical methodology. Such studies constitute the main current of American educational research and the basic currency for evaluating academic careers in this field.

Marshall and Barritt (1990) have analyzed the rhetoric of articles appearing in the American Educational Research Journal, the premier journal of the American Educational Research Association. They see this writing as being strongly influenced by the "objectivist tradition" in which research is seen as "not a rhetorical process of argumentation but rather a scientific one of method" (p. 605). Through the aggressive use of citation, the authors of articles in AERJ draw on prior research in an effort to present the current work as part of an objective accumulation of positive knowledge. And through the use of passive and impersonal constructions, their "language creates 'researcher' as a role that masks the researcher as a person..." (p. 597) and

suggests that the evidence somehow speaks for itself. Lying behind this rhetoric is both a reformist assumption -- "that there is a particular problem to be solved, and, once solved, that education will be improved" (p. 599) -- and a hierarchical assumption -- that researchers (not teachers, students, or parents) are the authoritative source for these solutions.

In the narrow world of academic journals, educational researchers speak to each other about the arcane details of Doing Science in a rhetoric which underscores the exclusiveness of a community of experts who are truly in the know about the science of education. Yet this scientistic rhetoric spills over into the larger discourse about education in important ways. One way is through the second-tier journals (such as Phi Delta Kappan and Teacher Magazine) that are oriented toward practitioners and policymakers, who are not part of the club of experts but who stand as important consumers of this expertise. Accompanying these journals are such publications as What Works (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1986), the federal government's effort to summarize the findings of educational research for the same audience. These kinds of publications provide translations of scientific results into a more accessible language and a more practical and prescriptive form.

From here the research finds its way into most of the prominent recent documents seeking to promote educational reform. Consider such nationally significant reports as A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986), and the 23 different policy-oriented products of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (published between 1968 and 1973). One need only leaf through one of these documents (or dozens of other similar pieces issued in the last decade or two) to find an impressive array of research findings neatly summarized and

graphically displayed for maximum effect -- all in order to provide a foundation of scientific rhetoric as support for the reform proposals that follow, proposals which appear to rise inexorably from this firm base.

The scientistic rhetoric of educational reform expresses a vision of the structure and process of educational change that is grounded in what Michel Foucault (1977, 1980) calls "disciplinary power." The latter term carries two related meanings. For one thing, it refers to the power of scientific disciplines (in this case, the science of education) to reorder the world in the image of their own favored formal-rational constructs. These disciplines have succeeded in imposing an abstract, universalistic, and timeless intellectual order on social practices which are concrete, particularistic, and time-bound (Toulmin, 1990). In line with these tendencies, scientific research on education (such as the research that serves as the rhetorical ground for Tomorrow's Teachers) takes particular practices within schools and conceptualizes them as examples of broader theoretical principles (Labaree, 1991). However, disciplinary power also refers to the way that power in modern societies operates through the medium of rationalized knowledge to exert discipline over the thought and behavior of citizens. Science then becomes a conscious or unconscious mechanism for social engineering, for exercising control based on systematically obtained data about social life. From this perspective, the science of education becomes an instrument of power over schools and over the students and teachers within them (Labaree, 1991).

Viewed as an expression of disciplinary power, rhetorical appeals to the science of education are dangerous for two reasons. First, rationalized constructs cannot capture the complex ways in which schools work. Good teaching is inherently unrationalizable, since it must be responsive to the peculiarities of time and place and to the needs of individual students;

general rules just do not prove very helpful to teachers in the day-to-day decisions they must make in classrooms. (See, for example, Lampert, 1985; Buchmann, 1984; Cohen, 1987; Cherryholmes, 1988.) Therefore, the science of education provides an image of schooling that is neither accurate nor helpful. Second, the effort to intervene in schools on the basis of these scientific constructs is inherently antidemocratic. It elevates the university expert over the classroom practitioner and the citizen, and it effectively removes schools from popular control by transforming from a political problem (amenable to democratic process) into a technical problem which can only be solved by those with the necessary specialized knowledge (Labaree, 1991; Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985). In addition, it relieves the policymaker of the need to construct a political (that is to say, generally understandable) rationale for a particular educational policy, since the latter can be portrayed as part of an effort simply to put into practice what "research says."

Democratic Rhetoric and the Voice of the Citizen

Four years after issuing Tomorrow's Teachers, the Holmes Group issued a second report whose rhetoric is startlingly different. Gone are all those references to the science of education. Gone is the image of education as a technical problem that will respond to a healthy dose of research-based knowledge. Gone is the comfortably hierarchical vision of professors leading practitioners into the golden circle of professionalism. Gone is the confident voice of the expert. In Tomorrow's Schools, the rhetorical emphasis shifts from technique to politics, and the political values it appeals to are openly democratic and egalitarian. This is a text that seems to speak with the voice of the citizen.

The aim of this second report is, in the words of its subtitle, to lay out "Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools." Yet the reader actually learns little about what a professional development school (PDS) is from this document, much less how to build one. The text focuses more on principles than on design, more on defining the broad values that these schools should serve than the technical specifications that are required to construct them.

At the beginning of the report, there is an attempt to define a PDS in a way that seems to follow directly from the professionalization rhetoric of the earlier document -- as "a school for the development of novice professionals, for continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession" (Holmes Group, 1990, p. 1, emphasis in original). However, the argument that follows shows that this time around the Holmes Group is putting forth a view of professionalism that looks well beyond a narrow concern for specialized knowledge to loftier goals of democratic participation and egalitarian process. In this report the authors argue that professional development will indeed improve education, but they assert that the goal of such improvement is to prepare students for active citizenship in a democratic society and that this goal can only be accomplished through the collaboration of professors and teachers. These two themes -- citizenship and collaboration -- provide the basic rhetorical structure for the main body of the text, which is devoted to a discussion of six basic principles for professional development schools. These principles include the following:

Principle One. Teaching and learning for understanding...

Principle Two. Creating a learning community...

Principle Three. Teaching and learning for understanding for everybody's children...

Principle Four. Continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators...

Principle Five. Thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning...

Principle Six. Inventing a new institution... (p. 7)

In expounding the first three principles, the authors make it clear that they are advocating more than an increase in the technical efficiency by which schools deliver knowledge to students. They are arguing for "schools to help students...take an active rather than a passive role" (p. 10) in their own education, so they will learn "how to make knowledge and meaning -- to enact culture not merely acquire it" (p. 10, emphasis in original). The reason for this concern about understanding and community is explicitly political:

> The ideals of democracy and teaching for understanding are intertwined. Passive learners will rarely think powerfully, nor will they make strong citizens of a free republic. You learn democracy -- both democratic discipline and free expression -- by living it in a community together (p. 25).

It follows that a school can only serve these broad democratic goals if it deliberately seeks to offer its benefits in such a way as to provide equal opportunity for those disadvantaged students who might otherwise be excluded from full participation in the society. A professional development school should therefore be a model institution for promoting democratic equality in American life.

In addition, according to principles four through six, such a school should be a model for promoting greater equality for teachers -- in relation to both school administrators (through a restructuring of roles within schools) and teacher educators (through a collaborative effort to learn about and

resolve educational problems). The latter goal provides a particularly striking contrast to the argument of the first report, which rested so solidly on the scientific authority of the university faculty. Instead of speaking ex cathedra as the high priests of educational research, the authors of the second report adopt a more ecumenical and less authoritative posture. As they say in the preface, "We would prefer this report to be read as an argument for efforts modest and particular..." (p. x), or, as they put it later, as "a challenge -- a call to action -- rather than a template for a single conception" (p. 6, emphasis in original).

Arising from this stance is a vision of collaboration between university and school faculty members in which both parties contribute and benefit equally.

> A Professional Development School must not become a colony settled by the university in the public schools. Rather, it should be an opportunity to join the strengths of the two institutions in pursuit of common purposes, and to combine their intellectual and material resources to more powerfully pursue those purposes (p. 51).

Rejecting "the common view...that universities produce knowledge, and schools are supposed to implement their findings" (p. 56), a view that emerged loud and clear in the first report, the authors propose that PDS's should be sites for research that is jointly conceived and executed.

The rhetoric of Tomorrow's Schools is noteworthy because the method of persuasion used in this report is the polar opposite of the method used in Tomorrow's Teachers. Instead of appealing to the authority of science, it appeals to democratic values. While the rhetoric of Doing Science (used in the first report) rests its claims on scientific findings and the ability of experts to implement these findings, the rhetoric of Doing Good (used in the

second report) derives its power from shared values and a collective commitment by reformers to put these values into practice. Tomorrow's Schools provides no sociological or historical evidence to show that professional development schools would in fact serve the kind of democratic and egalitarian goals it proposes for them. Instead of looking for such evidence, the reader is supposed to respond to the report's stirring political appeal. We are swayed by the possibilities of professional development schools because we want to accomplish the kinds of generous and politically attractive goals to which this reform effort is dedicated. To respond to this proposal in a skeptical or critical manner is to risk appearing unconcerned about doing something good for American schoolchildren.

By successfully tapping into core democratic values, the proposal for PDS's carries a certain face validity as a project that should work just because it is so right-minded. But in addition, it derives rhetorical force from the sense it transmits that the Holmes Group members and their allies are thoroughly dedicated to accomplishing these treasured outcomes. Such dedication is necessary because the task is so difficult. The entrenched bureaucratic structure of education stands as an imposing challenge to anyone seeking a radical transformation of the way schools have traditionally done things. At the end of the report, the authors sum up the situation this way:

> Creating [democratic learning] communities is the essential task. It will take a long time. That is why we in the Holmes Group are in for the long haul. And it can only be done, in the main, by teachers, administrators, and teacher educators -- although, as matters stand, they will need a great deal of help. Any single item on our agenda will be very difficult to accomplish. Taken together, the complete package we

propose is formidable indeed. But the sense that we are moving in the right direction will sustain us in the struggle (p. 95).

Understood in this way, the rhetoric of the second Holmes Group report fits the mold of the kind of educational reform literature which justifies itself as a form of Doing Good. In this genre, the account of educational reform takes on many of the characteristics of a heroic narrative. Tomorrow's Schools is one example of such a narrative, and another is a more famous reform report of the last decade, A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). These accounts always start with a problem of heroic proportions, embellished with a bit of exaggeration and with a selective use of evidence. We know the horror stories that emerge from such narratives: illiterate high school graduates, plummeting achievement levels, horrifying comparisons with foreign countries, dismayed employers confronting workers who lack basic skills. The Holmes Group spells out the size of the problem in some detail in its first report, in which it argues that the improvement of education depends on the improvement of teaching. However: "The quality of teachers will not be improved unless we improve the quality of their education -- and we cannot accomplish this task without changing the universities, the credentialing systems, and the schools themselves" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 23). This is a daunting task, but A Nation at Risk identifies an even greater problem, asserting that "the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people (p. 5)." These are both problems of educational reform that make ordinary mortals quake, problems that have persisted so long and grown so serious precisely because these mortals have proven incapable of resolving them.

Enter the heroes (the educational reformers who are telling the story) with a solution in hand. These heroes, it turns out, are just like the rest of us only more so. They share our fundamental values; but, unlike the rest of us, they pursue those values to the logical conclusion. While lesser beings confound these values with more mundane concerns and become caught up in petty diversions, heroic reformers keep focused on essential truths and resolutely orient themselves toward ultimate goals. What they are struggling against -- the true target of the reform effort -- is that accumulation of human weaknesses that have become embedded within institutions like education: tradition, ignorance, bureaucracy, self interest, apathy. They rise above these failings of the common folk not only through of their ability to focus on essential values but also through their willingness to stay with the struggle all the way through to its conclusion. They display both clarity of purpose and strength of resolution. Unlike the specialized knowledge and technical skill that is essential to scientistic rhetoric, these traits are accessible to the ordinary citizen. Hero-reformers are simply citizens who actualize the capacities for Doing Good that exist within all of us. They lead us to remodel our institutions in the image of our better selves.

What is particularly persuasive about the rhetoric of Doing Good, then, is the way it presents both the problem and the solution as understandable and the way it potentially draws a broad range of the public into the reform arena as possible participants. There is nothing necessarily esoteric or technical or exclusive about the task at hand, according to both Tomorrow's Schools and A Nation at Risk. We just need to buckle down and do what is right for our schools. Everyone can help; the leaders of the reform are portrayed simply as first among equals.

What is particularly dangerous about the rhetoric of Doing Good, however, is the way it fails to operationalize its central values and therefore leaves open the question of how to construct a reform effort which will conscientiously carry out these goals. The rhetoric in the second Holmes report is quite vague and unrestrictive in comparison with that in the earlier document. In part this is a convenient consequence of the report's collaborative ideology, which argues that university professors should not prescribe the structure of schools but that the details should be worked out on each site in an atmosphere of egalitarian exchange. In part, however, the vagueness is an artifact of the discursive process that produced the report -- a series of six seminars involving a heterogeneous array of education professors, school administrators, and teachers. The authors present the report as a summary of these deliberations; yet, as a participant in one of these seminars and an observer at several others, I suggest that the diffuseness of these discussions and the diversity of views expressed by the participants made it difficult to derive any sort of coherent findings. In the absence of specific agreement in the seminars about what a PDS should be, therefore, the authors of the report were compelled to find their consensus at a higher level of abstraction, around values -- democracy and collaboration -- to which everyone could subscribe as long as no one tried to operationalize them.

The net effect of this tendency toward vagueness, however, is that Tomorrow's Schools emerges more as a statement of democratic faith than as a program for educational reform. Under these loosely-defined principles, virtually any school in which professors and teachers are talking about educational change can call itself a professional development school. It is difficult to conceive of any effort of this sort in which the participants

would not willingly rally around such positive and diffuse slogans as "teaching and learning for understanding" and "inventing a new institution." Yet if the laudable goals for PDS's proposed by the report cannot constrain the form or outcome of these ventures, then what benefit do these goals provide except to grant political cover to reform efforts that may acquire their structure and direction from other less desirable sources? One such source of the latter sort, ironically, may well be the kind of research-based expertise promoted by the first Holmes report.

In the absence of a strong set of operational incentives encouraging the reform effort to stay on the democratic path, it seems likely that disciplinary power will fill the void and exercise the dominant influence over the direction and character that the reform will take. Whereas the democratic rhetoric of the second Holmes Group report eschews prescription, the scientific rhetoric of the first report embraces it. The science of education on which the earlier report bases its claims provides an authoritative blueprint for implementing reform. We know what works, the report says, and all we have to do is put this positive knowledge into practice. In addition, educational science has produced a set of actors prepared and motivated to pursue the implementation. Education professors at research-oriented universities are both the researchers who created this science and the teachers who authoritatively transmit it to preservice and inservice teachers. They are the experts with the specialized knowledge and the personal incentive to follow through on their own prescriptions, convincing the patient to swallow the medicine and follow doctor's orders. They have the best understanding of the technical issues arising from the science of education; they have the greatest reason to take these issues seriously; and they have the institutional authority (derived from

their positions at the university) to make their technical vision of education appear incontrovertible.

Grand visions for educational reform never exert much effect on practice in schools unless they can operationalize the design into a system of practicable consequences and invest a particular set of actors with the ability and incentive to champion this system. Democratic reform rhetoric typically has failed on both counts. Too diffuse in its goals and too inclusive in its call to action, it has provided neither a clear definition of success nor a cadre capable of achieving it. But scientistic rhetoric taps into the structure of disciplinary power, which is able to provide both the plan and the personnel. When the two rhetorics are combined in a single reform effort, the result is particularly effective and particularly misleading. It is effective because the reform's democratic appeal draws in wide political support for the effort while the reform's disciplinary underpinnings provide substance and agency. It is misleading because both the substance and the agents of reform reflect a politics which is directly at odds with democratic values.

For example, A Nation at Risk mixes the two rhetorics with great facility, but they should not be regarded as carrying equal weight in defining the character of the reforms it proposes. As a leading document in the educational "excellence" movement of the 1980s, this report presents a democratic rationale for what is at heart an agenda of social efficiency. It argues that

> A high level of shared education is essential to a free, democratic society and to the fostering of a common culture, especially in a country that prides itself on pluralism and individual freedom (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 7).

Yet throughout the report, it is made clear that what puts the nation most at risk is not the inadequate preparation of empowered citizens but the inadequate

production of skilled workers. A more effective educational system will make American industry more competitive by raising the productivity of its workforce.

> If only to keep and improve on the slim competitive edge we still retain in world markets, we must dedicate ourselves to the reform of our educational system for the benefit of all... Learning is the indispensable investment required for success in the "information age" we are entering (p. 7).

Fairly bristling with disciplinary power, the report draws on no fewer than 40 commissioned papers by university researchers and the testimony of dozens of other academics who appeared at the Commission's hearings around the country, all of whom are dutifully listed at the back (pp. 42-61). These individuals helped provide the commission with an authoritative technical prescription for how to achieve effective education -- such as by promoting higher academic standards, greater duration and intensity of instruction, and reinforced systems of testing.

Like the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the Holmes Group also employs both the rhetoric of Doing Science and the rhetoric of Doing Good in support of its reform proposals. Unlike the commission, however, and unlike most contemporary reform groups, the Holmes Group highlights the radically different implications of the two rhetorics by using the former in the first report and the latter in the second, instead of intermingling them in both documents. By so doing, it encourages a critical analysis of the reform's rhetoric and, through such an analysis, a critical examination of the contradictory tendencies embedded within the reform movement itself. As a result, it provides an opportunity to consider the qualitative difference between making a vague appeal to democratic values as the basis for reform and

relying on disciplinary power to define the reform and carry it into schools. This analysis leaves me with a sense that the professional development school is more likely to become an expression of the university's vision of what schools should be than a truly collaborative effort between professors and teachers. It may well become just what the democratic rhetoric of Tomorrow's Schools said it "must not," namely "a colony settled by the university in the public schools" (p. 51). In such an institution, the voice of the expert drowns out the voice of the citizen, and the voice of the teacher as well.

References

Aronowitz, S. A. & Giroux, H. A. (1985). Education under siege. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Buchmann, M. (1984). The use of research knowledge in teacher education and teaching. American Journal of Education, 92, 421-439.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1987). The political project of Tomorrow's teachers. Social Education, 51(7), 501-505.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education. New York: Teachers College.

Cohen, D. K. (1987). Educational technology, policy, and practice. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9(2), 153-170.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punish. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1980). The Foucault reader (P. Rabinow, ed.). New York: Pantheon.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Labaree, D. F. (1991). Power, knowledge, and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teachers. Unpublished paper.

Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. Harvard Educational Review, 55, 178-194.

Marshall, M. J. & Barritt, L. S. (1990). Choices made, worlds created: The rhetoric of AERJ. American Educational Research Journal, 27, 589-609.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at risk. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Toulmin, S. (1990). Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity. New York: Free Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (1986). What works: Research about teaching and learning. Washington, DC. Selections.